(1)

Supreme Court, U.S.

No. 98 825 NOV 18 1998

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1998

AMIEL CUETO,
Petitioner,

--against--

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF
APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ
1575 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02138
(617) 495-4617
COUNSEL OF RECORD

ATTORNEYS FOR PETITIONER
AMIEL CUETO

VICTORIA B. EIGER
CHRISTOPHER CUETO
Of Counsel

74 pp

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Whether the omnibus provision of Section 1503, the federal obstruction of justice statute, reaches quintessential litigation-related activities undertaken by a lawyer on behalf of a client, including the filing of a petition for certiorari in this Court, as long as the jury determines that the lawyer acted corruptly, with corruptly defined to mean that defendant should reasonably have seen that the natural and probable consequences of his act was the obstruction of justice.

2. Does the First Amendment permit the conviction of a person for obstruction of justice, based on efforts to persuade a local prosecutor to indict a state official for misconduct in the performance of his duties where the defendant maintains that the misconduct charges were true and the government has not shown otherwise.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iv

OPINIONS BELOW 1

JURISDICTION OF THIS COURT 1

STATUTES AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 2

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT 10

POINT I THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT'S DECISION, WHICH RENDERS ALL LITIGATION-RELATED ACTIVITY PUNISHABLE UNDER THE OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE STATUTE IF UNDERTAKEN WITH A CORRUPT MOTIVE, IMPERILS THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM 10

POINT II CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE FIRST AMENDMENT PLACES ANY LIMITATIONS ON AN OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE PROSECUTION BASED ON A CITIZEN'S EFFORTS TO

PERSUADE A LOCAL PROSECUTOR TO INDICT A STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER FOR MISCONDUCT IN THE PERFORMANCE OF HIS DUTIES AND THE PUBLICATION OF AN EDITORIAL ON THAT SUBJECT 19

CONCLUSION 24

APPENDIX

Decision of the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit . . . . . App. 1

Order Denying Petition for Rehearing and Suggestion for Rehearing En Banc . . . . . App. 35

Memorandum and Order of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois . . . . . App. 36

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Bill Johnson's Restaurants, Inc. v. NLRB,
461 U.S. 731 (1983) 20, 21

Buckley v. Valeo,
424 U.S. 1 (1976) 23

City of Columbia v. Omni Outdoor Advertising,
499 U.S. 365 (1991) 13

Gentile v. State Bar of Nevada,
501 U.S. 1030 (1991) 24

Herbert v. Lando,
441 U.S. 153 (1979) 20

Hubbard v. United States,
514 U.S. 695 (1995) 18

Morrison v. Olson,
487 U.S. 654 (1988) 24

Nebraska Press Assn. v. Stuart,
427 U.S. 539 (1976) 23

New York Times v. Sullivan,
376 U.S. 254 (1964) 21

Sheppard v. Maxwell,
384 U.S. 333 (1966) 23

St. Amant v. Thompson,
390 U.S. 727 (1968) 21

United States v. Aguilar,
515 U.S. 593 (1993) 11, 12, 14

United States v. Cihak,
137 F.3d 252 (5th Cir. 1998) 12

United States v. Cintolo.
818 F.2d 980 (1st Cir.), cert. denied,
484 U.S. 913 (1987) 6

United States v. Hylton,
710 F.2d 1106 (5th Cir. 1983) 22

United States v. Machi,
811 F.2d 991 (7th Cir. 1987) 13, 14

United States v. Monus,
128 F.3d 376 (6th Cir. 1997), cert. denied,
1998 WL 334064 (Oct. 5, 1998) 12

United States v. Sagit,
991 F.2d 702 (11th Cir.), cert. denied,
510 U.S. 950 (1993) 14

United States v. Walton,
36 F.3d 32 (7th Cir. 1994) 20

Venezia v. Robinson,
16 F.3d 209 (7th Cir.), cert. denied,
513 U.S. 815 (1994) 4, 5

Wayte v. United States,
470 U.S. 598 (1985) 22

STATUTES AND RULES

18 U.S.C. § 401 15

18 U.S.C. § 1001 18

18 U.S.C. § 1503 ..... passim

28 U.S.C. § 1254 1

Fed. R. Crim. Pro. R. 42 15

U.S.S.G. § 5K1.1 17

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Prosser, Torts, Malicious Prosecution § 119 22

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is reported at 151 F.3d 620 (7th Cir. 1998).

JURISDICTION OF THIS COURT

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was rendered on July 31, 1998. (App. 1) A petition for rehearing with suggestion for rehearing en banc was timely filed, and denied by order dated August 24, 1998. (App. 35) This Court has jurisdiction to review the judgment of the Court of Appeals pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1254.

STATUTES AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

18 U.S.C. § 1503 provides:

Influencing or injuring officer or juror generally

> Whoever corruptly, or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, endeavors to influence, intimidate, or impede any grand or petit juror, or officer in or of any court of the United States, or officer who may be serving at any examination or other proceeding before any United States commissioner or other committing magistrate, in the discharge of his duty, or injures any such grand or petit juror in his person or property on account of any verdict or indictment assented to by him, or on account of his being or having been such juror, or injures any such officer, commissioner, or other committing magistrate in his person or property on account of the performance of his official

> duties, or corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstructs, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

U.S. Const., Amendment I provides:

> Congress shall make no law ... abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The omnibus clause of 18 U.S.C. § 1503, the federal obstruction of justice statute, is among the most powerful tools available to a prosecutor. In this case, it was used to prosecute an attorney who had acted aggressively on behalf of a client. After the prosecutor obtained an indictment and won a conviction against the client, she went after Petitioner, making a deal with the client to testify against his former attorney, and, ultimately, obtaining a conviction. Petitioner is currently serving a prison term of 87 months, justified according to the sentencing court's pronouncement, because Petitioner had "abused the First Amendment." (Sentencing Tr. at 65)

As argued later in this Petition and in an amicus brief filed in the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, Petitioner's "crimes" and the prosecution's theory of criminal culpability are of grave concern to the criminal defense bar, and should be of concern to all lawyers. Quite simply, Petitioner's crimes consisted of unexceptional litigation-related activities, including the filing of a petition for a writ of certiorari with this Court.

These acts were rendered criminal, according to the prosecution, and according to the Seventh Circuit in affirming the conviction, not because the government proved that the court papers contained false statements (as the indictment had charged), or were improper in some other way, but because the jury could have found that they were filed "corruptly" or "with a corrupt motive." Both "corruptly" and "corrupt motive" were defined so vaguely and broadly that they provide no significant limitation on what may be prosecuted under the omnibus clause, vesting virtually unfettered discretion in prosecutors to go after their adversaries or former adversaries, and providing no rational basis on which courts or juries -- or lawyers -- can distinguish between litigation-related activities that are acts of lawyering (essential to the proper functioning of the adversarial system) and those that are federal felonies.

The charges against Petitioner arose out of the investigation and prosecution of Thomas Venezia. In 1995, following a joint state-federal investigation, Venezia was indicted on federal racketeering charges involving the placement of video poker games on which illegal payouts were made at liquor-selling establishments in Southern Illinois. Petitioner served as Venezia's lawyer during the investigation, and Venezia continued to depend on Petitioner after the racketeering indictment was returned.

Following Venezia's conviction, a new indictment was returned against Venezia and Petitioner, arising out of the investigation and prosecution of the racketeering case. Following recusal of all the local district court judges, the Hon. Stephen N. Limbaugh was brought in to preside over the case.

Count 1 of the new indictment alleged a far-reaching conspiracy to defraud the United States, in which the conspiratorial purposes and acts consisted of alleged obstructions of justice which were also pled as separate substantive counts.

Venezia struck a deal with the government and testified against Petitioner, who was convicted of conspiracy and three counts of obstruction of justice under § 1503's omnibus clause. Two of these obstruction of justice counts, Counts 2 and 7, were premised on the filing of what the indictment called "false pleadings."

Count 2 alleged obstruction of justice in connection with Venezia v. Robinson, a state civil injunction action removed to federal court, brought by Petitioner, as counsel for Venezia, against Bonds Robinson, a state liquor control commission agent. Robinson, who, at some point, began working undercover with the FBI in the investigation of Venezia, had conducted a series of raids at establishments where Venezia had video poker games. In his other undercover role, Robinson sought to catch Venezia offering him money to stop the raids. Petitioner commenced Venezia v. Robinson seeking to enjoin Robinson from harassing Venezia and his customers. Petitioner obtained Robinson's presence at the injunction hearing, and, there, under oath, Robinson disclosed that there was an ongoing investigation and that he was working with the FBI. The state court issued an order, enjoining Robinson from engaging in illegal activities.

When the raids continued, Petitioner sought to enforce the injunction. Robinson, by then represented by the United States Attorney's office, removed the action to federal court, where United States District Judge William Stiehl dissolved the state court injunction. Cueto filed an appeal in the Seventh Circuit, and, after that failed, sought a writ of certiorari in this Court. See Venezia v. Robinson, 16 F.3d 209 (7th Cir.), cert. denied, 513 U.S. 815 (1994).

The specific obstruction of justice in Count 2 was the filing of a "false" brief in the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals and a "false" petition for a writ of certiorari in this Court. (Indictment at ¶¶ 63-64) The government claimed that the cert.

petition was false in that it stated that Venezia had a legitimate vending business (and did not mention illegal gambling machines) and "attacked the integrity" of the Seventh Circuit judges.

Count 7 charged obstruction based on allegedly "false pleadings" filed in the federal criminal racketeering case against Venezia. While Petitioner was denied a bill of particulars, and it was never entirely clear what the allegedly "false pleadings" underlying this count were, the government's position at trial seemed to be that Petitioner caused an attorney for one of Venezia's co-defendants in the racketeering case to file a motion to recuse Judge Stiehl, the judge who dissolved the state court's injunction and who was assigned to preside over the racketeering case.

Count 6 , which did not involve court filings, but which raises substantial First Amendment questions, also involved Bonds Robinson, the state liquor control officer. This count's operative language charged that Petitioner endeavored to obstruct justice by engaging in acts to "persuade the County State's Attorney [Robert Haida] to indict ... Robinson" on charges of perjury. (Indictment at ¶ 73) This count rested on the fact (undisputed by Petitioner) that, while the appeal to the Seventh Circuit in Venezia v. Robinson was pending and the FBI's investigation of Venezia continued, Petitioner examined Agent Robinson under oath at a suppression hearing in a gambling case arising from a raid on one of Venezia's customers. During his testimony, Robinson denied that he had ever taken a bribe from a certain beer distributor, Tony Joynt. Petitioner, contending (on information and belief) that Robinson had taken money from Joynt, urged State's Attorney Haida to indict Robinson for perjury. Haida commenced an investigation, but did not bring charges against Robinson.

Later, Petitioner announced his own intention to run for Haida's office, and published a newspaper editorial criticizing Haida for his failure to act. According to the government, these acts were undertaken to discredit Robinson, in furtherance of Petitioner's efforts to obstruct justice and defraud the United States. They were an important part of the government's case. However, at trial, the government produced no evidence whatsoever that Robinson had not taken a bribe from Joynt and had not perjured himself in denying it; the government called neither Robinson nor Joynt to testify at Petitioner's trial. The defendant was not allowed to testify about the basis for his belief that Robinson had accepted money from Joynt.

Petitioner moved, pre-trial, to dismiss the indictment insofar as it rested on the filing of court papers or on acts to persuade the local prosecutor to bring charges against Robinson, urging that such conduct was not a crime under § 1503. The district court denied the motion. (App. 36) Accepting the government's arguments, the court held that any act, whether itself legal or not, may be prosecuted under § 1503 if it "obstructs or impedes the due administration of justice" and is undertaken "with a corrupt or improper purpose." (App. 40) Citing United States v. Cintolo, 818 F.2d 980 (1st Cir.), cert. denied, 484 U.S. 913 (1987), the district court held that "otherwise lawful means, even those undertaken by an attorney in the course of representing a client can transgress § 1503 if employed with ... corrupt intent." (App. 41)

At trial, the government's theory was that Petitioner's actions constituted obstruction of justice because Petitioner had a corrupt motive: a financial interest in Venezia's continued criminal conduct. In its case in chief, the government introduced evidence that Petitioner and Venezia were partners in a number of businesses that were themselves legitimate, but in which, the government claimed, Venezia could not have participated but for his gambling revenues. The government also sought to prove

that Petitioner had a direct financial interest, with Venezia, in Club Exposed, an establishment that offered illegal video poker games, and profited from them. Petitioner did not dispute that he and Venezia had interests in a number of legitimate business ventures, but did dispute that he had any interest in Club Exposed. He testified at trial that he did not. The jury was not asked to resolve this dispute.

Having rejected Petitioner's position that the filing of court papers and other litigation-related activities by an attorney could not constitute obstruction of justice, regardless of the actor's motives, the trial court charged the jury that any act may violate § 1503. Consistent with Seventh Circuit law, the jury was instructed that:

> The law prohibiting the obstruction of justice, under Section 1503, is designed to prevent a miscarriage of justice resulting from corrupt methods.
>
> . . .
>
> The due administration of justice refers to the fair, impartial, uncorrupted and unimpeded investigation, prosecution, disposition, or trial of any matter, civil or criminal, in the courts of the United States.
>
> . . .
>
> The key word in the statute is endeavor.
>
> As used in this statute, endeavor means any effort or any act, however, contrived, to obstruct, impede, or interfere with the grand jury or trial proceedings.

> And it is the endeavor which is the gist of the crime. The endeavor need not be successful, but it must have at least a reasonable tendency to influence, obstruct, or impede the due administration of justice.
>
> . . .
>
> Corruptly means to act with the purpose of obstructing justice.
>
> The United States is not required to prove that the defendant's only or even main purpose was to obstruct the due administration of justice.
>
> The government only has to establish that the defendant should have reasonably seen that the natural and probable consequences of his acts was the obstruction of justice.
>
> . . .
>
> Any act, by any party, whether lawful or unlawful on its face, may violate Section 1503, if performed with a corrupt motive.
>
> The statute reaches all corrupt conduct capable of producing an effect that prevents justice from being duly administered, regardless of the means employed.
>
> Any means, though lawful in themselves, can cross the line of illegality, if employed with a corrupt motive to hinder the due administration of justice, so long as the means have the capacity to obstruct.

(Tr. Vol. 32 at 67-69)

The jury returned guilty verdicts on the conspiracy to defraud count and on the three obstruction of justice counts described above.

On appeal, Petitioner argued that § 1503 was unconstitutionally vague as applied to the conduct at issue; that the Seventh Circuit's definition of "corruptly" exacerbated the problem; that § 1503 did not cover the filing of briefs or other court papers, even if shown to contain "false" statements; and that the government had not proved that the subject pleadings were in any way false, let alone, false in a material way. With respect to the count charging that Petitioner had tried to persuade the local prosecutor to indict a law enforcement officer, he urged (among other things) that this conduct was constitutionally protected regardless of his motives.

The Court of Appeals affirmed. With respect to the false pleadings counts, it held that the validity of the convictions did not depend on whether the papers contained falsities or were in any other way improper. According to the Court, even wholly proper, well-grounded, and meritorious litigation-related conduct -- what the court called "otherwise legal conduct" -- violates § 1503 if undertaken with an improper or corrupt motive. The Court ruled that the jury's verdict established that the jury found that Petitioner had a corrupt motive. It rejected the constitutional challenge to Count 6 (endeavoring to persuade the local prosecutor to indict Bonds Robinson for perjury), noting that "speech which is false and misleading is not protected by the First Amendment," and holding that the conduct at issue "is not the kind of conduct with even a colorable claim to First Amendment protection." (App. 22, n.11)

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

POINT I

THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT'S DECISION, WHICH RENDERS ALL LITIGATION-RELATED ACTIVITY PUNISHABLE UNDER THE OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE STATUTE IF UNDERTAKEN WITH A CORRUPT MOTIVE, IMPERILS THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

The Seventh Circuit has held that any lawyer who undertakes legitimate, litigation-related steps on his client's behalf may properly be found guilty of obstruction of justice (and conspiracy to defraud the United States) if his acts allow the client to continue a criminal enterprise or the client is engaged in criminal activity from which the lawyer may indirectly benefit. According to the Seventh Circuit, because of the limited nature of appellate review, federal appeals courts are powerless to reverse such a conviction. The opinion of the Seventh Circuit states repeatedly that legitimate lawyering becomes criminal when undertaken "corruptly," "with corrupt intent," or as part of a "corrupt endeavor." Under that decision, a corrupt endeavor can be found by a jury if the endeavor "protects" an illegal practice or safeguards the lawyer's own financial interest.

Under the Seventh Circuit's decision, most lawyers (and virtually all who practice criminal law) are subject to indictment and conviction. No protection is available from the reviewing court. Only the unreviewable exercise of prosecutorial discretion protects honest lawyers from being lumped together with those perceived by prosecutors to be corrupt. Whether government lawyers have unbounded discretion to prosecute their own adversaries, and whether the court has any power (or obligation) to redress prosecutorial overreaching, are at issue in this case.

Section 1503, which is set out in full supra at 1-2, was described by Justice Rehnquist in United States v. Aguilar:

> [F]irst, it proscribes persons from endeavoring to influence, intimidate, or impede grand or petit jurors or court officers in the discharge of their duties; it then prohibits injuring grand or petit jurors in their person or property because of any verdict or indictment rendered by them; it then prohibits injury of any court officer, commissioner, or similar officer on account of the performance of their official duties; finally the "Omnibus Clause" serves as a catchall, prohibiting persons from endeavoring to influence, obstruct, or impede the due administration of justice.

515 U.S. 593, 598 (1995).

The Circuits are in general agreement as to the elements of the offense proscribed by the omnibus clause. First, the government must prove that there was a pending judicial proceeding. Second, the defendant must have known that the proceeding was pending. Finally, the government must show that the defendant corruptly endeavored to influence, obstruct or impede the due administration of justice. See e.g., United States v. Morvis, 178 F.3d 376, 387 (6th Cir. 1997), cert. denied, 119 S. Ct. 67 (1998); United States v. Wood, 6 F.3d 692, 695 (10th Cir. 1993); United States v. Williams, 874 F.2d 968, 977 (5th Cir. 1989). It is this third element that is at issue in this case. As Justice Scalia noted in his concurring and dissenting opinion in Aguilar, the omnibus clause and the "endeavors" it proscribes have been given a "generous reading." Id. at 609.

The Seventh Circuit has read the clause to proscribe an expansive category of conduct and to reach any act – lawful or

not – that may interfere with the judicial process. That court is not alone. The Fifth Circuit recently described the reach of the omnibus clause as follows: "Obstruction of justice involves any attempt to impede the due administration of justice." United States v. Cihak, 137 F.3d 252, 262 (5th Cir. 1998).

Aguilar, of course, noted that there do exist "metes and bounds on the very broad language" of the provision, and itself established a limiting principle: a required "nexus in time, causation or logic" between the defendant's acts and judicial proceedings that are pending. 515 U.S. at 599. However, neither the Aguilar rule, nor the requirement that the government prove that there was a pending judicial proceeding of which the defendant had knowledge, see, e.g., United States v. Monus, 128 F.3d 376, 387 (6th Cir. 1997), cert. denied, 1998 WL 334064 (Oct. 5, 1998), operates as a significant limiting principle where the acts of lawyers, undertaken in the course of litigation, are concerned. Such acts will almost always have a nexus to a known and pending judicial proceeding.

Still, Petitioner submits the omnibus clause cannot properly be read to criminalize all endeavors "to influence ... the due administration of justice" which have the required nexus. Most of what lawyers do are attempts to influence the justice system, and to affect the outcome of particular proceedings.

Where conduct that is not itself a crime is concerned, the limiting principle separating lawful from criminal activity is, theoretically, provided by the "intent" requirement. Only endeavors that are undertaken "corruptly" violate the statute. But, as this case shows, "corruptly" is itself difficult to define with precision, and the federal courts have had great difficulty defining it.[1]

---

[1] This Court has noted the difficulties in defining "corruption" in the context of municipal corporations antitrust

The Seventh Circuit has said that "corruptly" means "with the purpose of obstructing justice." United States v. Machi, 811 F.2d 991, 996 (7th Cir. 1987). However, the gloss the Seventh Circuit has placed on this already rather circular definition eliminates whatever limitation it might be thought to provide. The Seventh Circuit has held that a defendant acts corruptly even where the purpose to obstruct justice is not the defendant's only or even main purpose.

In the Seventh Circuit, the requirement is met when the government shows that the defendant "should have reasonably seen" that obstruction of justice was the "natural and probable consequence of his act." Machi, 811 F.2d at 996. See also

---

immunity. The Court rejected the argument that

> ... "conspiracy" might be limited to instances of governmental "corruption," defined variously as "abandonment of public responsibilities to private interests," ... "corrupt or bad faith decisions," ... and "selfish or corrupt motives." ... Ultimately, [the respondent] asks us not to define "corruption" at all, but simply to leave that task to the jury: "[a]t bottom, however, it was within the jury's province to determine what constituted corrpution of the governmental process in their community." ...
>
> A conspiracy exception narrowed along such vague lines is ... impractical. Few governmental actions are immune from the charge that they are "not in the public interest" or in some sense "corrupt."

City of Columbia v. Omni Outdoor Advertising, 499 U.S. 365, 376-77 (1991).

United States v. Sagit, 991 F.2d 702, 713 (11th Cir.), cert. denied, 510 U.S. 950 (1993) (government is not required to prove that a defendant had the specific purpose of obstructing justice, but it must establish that the conduct was motivated, at least in part, by "a corrupt motive"). This takes Aguilar's "natural and probable effect" language -- which was designed to limit the conduct proscribed by the omnibus clause -- and makes it an aspect of the intent element in a way that dramatically expands the circumstances in which the defendant can be found to have the requisite intent. In any event, Petitioner's jury was so charged.

Where the defendant is a lawyer who has engaged in litigation-related conduct on behalf of a client, these definitions lead to startling results. A lawyer who acts for a client, even for an appropriate purpose and using wholly lawful means, will have acted "corruptly" if he should reasonably have foreseen that the natural and probable consequences of his act was the obstruction of justice. Since obstruction of justice is used as a shorthand for the phrase "influence ... the due administration of justice," this would cover most acts undertaken by lawyers.[2]

Where such standards are applied by juries to the conduct of attorneys, especially criminal defense attorneys, the dangers are patent. Jurors do not easily accept the function of criminal defense lawyers, much of whose work is directed at avoiding indictment or conviction of their clients, including those who are guilty and who do (unfortunately) go on to commit other crimes. To be sure, where a guilty client goes unpunished, defense attorneys have, in a sense, frustrated, impeded, or "obstructed" the administration of justice. But that is their function. The system cannot operate if attorneys' conduct is subject to scrutiny by their adversaries and determined by juries to be either the

---

[2] Case law does not address what the "due administration of justice" is or how it differs from the administration of justice, or justice itself.

practice or criminal law or a serious federal felony depending upon a jury's unguided, post hoc assessment of the attorneys's motives.

As the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers argued in the amicus brief it filed below, criminalizing even litigation-related misconduct under the omnibus clause will chill vigorous advocacy and destroy the delicate balance between prosecution and defense. Criminalizing litigation-related conduct whose only impropriety lies in the actor's motives poses even greater dangers.[3]

The Seventh Circuit appears to recognize these concerns, but states that its decision is a limited one, and will not affect honest members of the bar. But, the decision's language is not limited, and the factors which supposedly distinguish this case from others provide no real bounds. The court repeatedly states that Petitioner's conviction is valid because there was evidence

---

[3] The Seventh Circuit acknowledged that the policy concerns articulated by NACDL were "valid," but professed itself concerned about what it called "the flipside." "If lawyers are not punished for their criminal conduct and corrupt endeavors to manipulate the administration of justice, the result would be the same: the weakening of an ethical adversarial system and the undermining of just administration of the law." (App. at 18)

The Seventh Circuit failed to appreciate that this is not an either/or situation. A variety of means exist to punish attorneys for litigation-related misconduct, including various forms of attorney discipline under the Code of Professional Responsibility; contempt sanctions under Fed. R. Crim. Pro. R. 42 and 18 U.S.C. § 401; prosecutions for perjury, subornation of perjury, witness tampering, or making false declarations; or prosecution under the three specific provisions of § 1503.

from which the jury could have found that his purpose was "to protect the illegal gambling operation." (App. 17, 27) The jury, however, was never asked to decide that question. And, Petitioner had no real chance to defend against the charges that Venezia's conduct was illegal. The district court ruled, early on, that Petitioner could not "collaterally attack" court rulings made in proceedings that Petitioner was alleged to have obstructed justice in. Thus, he was not permitted to challenge Venezia's racketeering conviction, which, pursuant to Venezia's deal with the government, was not appealed. Equally important, and putting that problem aside, lawyers who have represented clients whose activities are later adjudicated to be criminal always can be said to have acted "to protect" illegal conduct; there is no substantial difference between "defending" and "protecting," certainly not one that jurors are likely to discern.

The Court of Appeals' alternative rationale -- that there was evidence from which the jury could have found that Petitioner acted to "safeguard his personal financial interest" (App. 21) -- is equally dangerous. If a lawyer's desire to "safeguard his personal financial interest" supplies a corrupt motive, then virtually all attorneys must be felons. Many lawyers, including those who work for Wall Street and white shoe firms, have financial interests in common with their clients; they often serve on the boards of, or hold stock in, companies they represent. Every lawyer who defends a forfeiture case or knows she will collect her full fee only if she succeeds in keeping her client out of jail has financial interests to safeguard. Lawyers in general have a financial stake in obtaining good results for their clients, because good results can translate into more business and more money.

The Seventh Circuit intimates that Petitioner's conviction is valid, not because of his financial motives, but because there was evidence that he was involved in his client's gambling activities and was himself a participant in those uncharged

crimes. But even that reading of the decision provides no real protection from overreaching in this or future cases.

If a lawyer is charged with substantive crimes, together with obstruction of justice, he at least has an opportunity to defend against the charges. Where, as here, no substantive crime is charged, no such opportunity exists. The Seventh Circuit itself acknowledged that the prosecution theory, and its failure to charge Petitioner in the underlying gambling/racketeering case, gave it "some pause," but determined that it was ultimately "inconsequential." (App. 16-17, n.10) It was hardly inconsequential. Affirmance of his conviction appears to rest on the premise that Petitioner did participate in the underlying gambling activity, though Petitioner had no chance to defend against those uncharged crimes, and the jury was never asked to decide that question.

The Seventh Circuit suggests that attorneys who have only "good" motives need not worry. In fact, all must feel uneasy. Defense attorneys, especially those who do their jobs creatively and aggressively, and who do not shy away from challenging authority, often get under the skin of prosecutors whom they oppose. Where such activity is undertaken on behalf of a client who is in fact guilty of a crime, prosecutors may truly come to believe that the attorney is endeavoring to obstruct justice and that justice will be done only if the attorney is also punished. The government's charging powers are immense; its ability to charge conspiracy or racketeering predicated on obstruction of justice raises the ante, and affords numerous procedural advantages. To make its case, the government can offer powerful incentives under § 5K1.1 of the Sentencing Guidelines to convince defendants to turn against their attorneys. Defendants -- especially those like Petitioner's client who are facing lengthy sentences -- have powerful reasons to turn. The relationship of trust that must exist for the attorney-client relationship to function properly cannot thrive in such a climate.

The criminal justice system and the defendants who pass through it will be the real losers. As Justice Scalia has warned, the threat of prosecution is enough to affect, in subtle and not-so-subtle ways, the quality and vigor of counsel's advocacy. In discussing why the former version of 18 U.S.C. § 1001 did not reach false statements made in the course of judicial proceedings, Justice Scalia recognized the

> serious concern that the threat of criminal prosecution under the capacious provisions of § 1001 will deter vigorous representation of opposing interests in adversarial litigation, particularly representation of criminal defendants, whose adversaries control the machinery of § 1001 prosecution

Hubbard v. United States, 514 U.S. 695, 717 (1995) (Scalia, J., concurring) (emphasis added).[4] That threat is greater under the even more capacious provisions of the omnibus obstruction of justice clause.

The criminal justice system cannot function properly if attorneys are at risk of criminal prosecution for otherwise wholly lawful conduct, including the filing of briefs, whenever their motives may be questioned. This case makes clear that some aspect of the equation must change -- whether it be a more limited definition of the acts which may constitute an endeavor to obstruct justice to exclude litigation related activities by lawyers, a more focused definition of the necessary mens rea, or

---

[4] Although Congress has amended § 1001 to cover statement to "the judicial branch," it expressly exempted "a party to a judicial proceeding, or that party's counsel for statements, representations, writings, or documents submitted by such party or counsel to a judge or magistrate in that proceeding." 18 U.S.C. § 1001 (b) (1996) (emphasis added).

-- at the very least -- an expansion of the appeals courts' powers of review in cases of this sort. Otherwise the obstruction of justice statute threatens to seriously undermine the very adversarial system that it is ostensibly designed to safeguard.

POINT II

CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE FIRST AMENDMENT PLACES ANY LIMITATIONS ON AN OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE PROSECUTION BASED ON A CITIZEN'S EFFORTS TO PERSUADE A LOCAL PROSECUTOR TO INDICT A STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER FOR MISCONDUCT IN THE PERFORMANCE OF HIS DUTIES AND THE PUBLICATION OF AN EDITORIAL ON THAT SUBJECT

The omnibus clause of the obstruction of justice statute, read to cover any "corrupt endeavor" to obstruct justice, may arguably bring within its sweep many acts thought to enjoy First Amendment protection. Indeed, this case involves a laundry list of acts and activities which have long been thought to lie at the very core of the First Amendment: complaining to authorities about government misconduct, instituting lawsuits and taking appeals, publishing newspaper editorials, and running for public office.

Petitioner stands convicted of "engaging in acts to persuade the St. Clair County States Attorney [Robert Haida] to indict Agent [Bonds] Robinson" (Indictment, ¶ 73), that is, petitioning a government official to take official action. The government claimed that Robinson did not perjure himself, but introduced no evidence whatsoever that Petitioner's complaint about Robinson was untrue, let alone that it was made with

knowledge that it was baseless. Rather, it was the government's theory that, regardless of the merits of Petitioner's accusation against Robinson, it constituted obstruction of justice because it was an attack on Robinson's integrity, undertaken "corruptly" to render Robinson ineffectual in the investigation of Venezia, or to discredit him as a potential witness against Venezia.

Petitioner urged at trial, and argued on appeal, that the government had not adduced any evidence that Petitioner's complaint about Robinson lacked merit, and that the trial court improperly foreclosed him from introducing evidence showing the basis for his belief that the complaint was well-founded. He also urged that the conduct charged was protected by the speech and petition clauses of the First Amendment, regardless of the existence of any improper or corrupt motive.

The Court of Appeals did not address Petitioner's claim that the conviction could not stand because the government had not proved that the charge against Robinson unfounded. The Court did expressly reject the constitutional argument, concluding that "Petitioner's conduct is not the kind of conduct with even a colorable claim to First Amendment protection." In explaining this ruling, it declared:

> Speech which is false and misleading is not protected by the First Amendment's right to freedom of speech. Herbert v. Lando, 441 U.S. 153, 171 (1979); United States v. Walton, 36 F.3d 32, 35 (7th Cir. 1994). Just as false statements are not immunized by the First Amendment, meritless litigation based on false accusations and criminal intentions does not fall within the scope of protected speech and "is not immunized by the First Amendment's right to petition." Bill Johnson's Restaurants, Inc. v. NLRB, 461 U.S. 731, 743 (1983).

(App. 22, n.11)

It is axiomatic, however, that even speech that is false and misleading enjoys substantial constitutional protection.[5] And the kind of speech here at issue -- not commercial speech but speech criticizing the conduct of a law enforcement agent and calling for official action against him -- is the kind of speech that enjoys the greatest constitutional protection of all. After all:

> erroneous statement is inevitable in free debate, and ... it must be protected if the freedoms of expression are to have the "breathing space" that they "need ... to survive."

New York Times v. Sullivan, 376 U.S. 254, 271-72 (1964) (citations omitted).

Moreover,

> Authoritative interpretations of the First Amendment guarantees have consistently refused to recognize an exception for any test of truth -- whether administered by judges, juries, or administrative officials -- and especially one that puts the burden of proving truth on the speaker.

Id. at 241 (citations omitted). "[T]o insure ascertainment and publication of the truth about public affairs, it is essential that the First Amendment protect some erroneous publications as well as true ones." St. Amant v. Thompson, 390 U.S. 727, 732 (1968).

---

[5] Indeed, in Bill Johnson's Restaurants, Inc., this Court, recognizing First Amendment concerns, held that the NLRB could not enjoin as an unfair labor practice a suit brought against an employee for a retaliatory motive unless the suit was also shown to be baseless or frivolous.

These First Amendment principles apply equally where the conduct at issue involves petitioning the government for redress of grievances. "Although the right to petition and the right to free speech are separate guarantees, they are generally subject to the same constitutional analysis." Wayte v. United States, 470 U.S. 598, 610, n.11 (1985).

The Court of Appeals held that the conduct "is not the kind of conduct" entitled to First Amendment protection, presumably on the ground that it was undertaken "corruptly" to obstruct justice. But government examination of a speaker's motives itself raises serious constitutional questions. Given the conduct at issue here, whatever Petitioner's motives, they cannot remove the constitutional protection that his conduct enjoyed. "It is the part of a good citizen to bring about the prosecution of those who are reasonably suspected of crime, ... the addition of a personal motive should not result in liability for performing a public obligation." Prosser, Torts, Malicious Prosecution, § 119.

The decision of the Seventh Circuit stands in direct conflict with a decision of the Fifth Circuit on this point. In United States v. Hylton, 710 F.2d 1106 (5th Cir. 1983), the defendant was charged with corruptly endeavoring to impede IRS agents under a statute proscribing "endeavors to obstruct or impede the due administration of [the tax code]." The charge was based on defendant's having instituted criminal trespass complaints against agents who had entered her property in search of her son. The trial court threw out the jury's conviction, ruling that the conduct was protected by the First Amendment. The Fifth Circuit affirmed. It held that, regardless of defendant's motives, her conduct -- filing a criminal complaint with local authorities against federal agents on grounds that state law recognized -- was an exercise of the right to petition for redress of grievances, protected by the First Amendment, even if her complaint challenged conduct that was privileged under federal law. Hylton, 710 F.2d at 1111. The Fifth Circuit squarely held

that Hylton's motivation -- her desire to impede the IRS investigation of her son -- was irrelevant; it did not remove the constitutional protection. Id. at 1112.

The additional conduct alleged in this case, including the seeking of political office, and the publication of a newspaper editorial critical of officials and their official acts, is no less entitled to constitutional protection. Cf. Buckley v. Valeo, 424 U.S. 1, 37, 54 (1976). People (including lawyers) seek office, disseminate political opinions, bring charges and defend against them for all sorts of reasons. Our constitutional system does not permit inquiry into what those reasons are, or permit prosecution for obstruction of justice if selfish or political motives can be discerned.

These rules lose none of their force because the criminal justice system is involved. In these contexts, the First Amendment interests are especially strong. As Justice Kennedy, writing for himself and three other Justices, has said:

> "[T]he press ... guards against the miscarriage of justice by subjecting the police, prosecutors, and judicial processes to extensive public scrutiny and criticism." [Sheppard v. Maxwell, 384 U.S. 333, 350 (1966).]
>
> Public awareness and criticism have even greater importance where, as here, they concern allegations of police corruption, see Nebraska Press Assn. v. Stuart, 427 U.S. 539 606 ... (1976) (Brennan, J., concurring in judgment) ("Commentary on the fact that there is strong evidence implicating a government official in criminal activity goes to the very core of matters of public concern"), or where, as is also the present circumstance, the criticism questions the

> judgment of an elected public prosecutor. Our system grants prosecutors vast discretion at all stages of the criminal process, see Morrison v. Olson, 487 U.S. 654, 727-28 ... (1988) (Scalia, J., dissenting). The public has an interest in its responsible exercise.

Gentile v. State Bar of Nevada, 501 U.S. 1030, 1035-36 (1991).

The Seventh Circuit's First Amendment ruling, that Petitioner's conduct "is not the kind of conduct with even a colorable claim to First Amendment protection" (App. 22, n.11), grossly misperceives the scope of the First Amendment's protections. If permitted to stand, it will chill the exercise of important First Amendment rights.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, the petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan M. Dershowitz
1575 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
(617) 495-4617

Victoria B. Eiger
Christopher Cueto
Of Counsel

Appendix

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Seventh Circuit

No. 97-3439

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

AMIEL CUETO,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Illinois.
No. 96 CR 30070—**Stephen N. Limbaugh**, *Judge.*

ARGUED MAY 11, 1998—DECIDED JULY 31, 1998

Before BAUER, FLAUM, and MANION, *Circuit Judges.*

BAUER, *Circuit Judge.* After a jury trial, Amiel Cueto was convicted of one count of conspiracy to defraud the United States, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371, and three counts of obstruction of justice, in violation of the omnibus clause of 18 U.S.C. § 1503. The district court sentenced Cueto to 87 months imprisonment and imposed monetary penalties. Cueto now appeals his convictions and sentence, arguing that: (1) the conviction for conspiracy to defraud is invalid because of constitutional infirmities as well as insufficiency of the evidence; (2) the convictions for obstruction of justice are also invalid because of constitutional infirmities and insufficiency of the evidence; (3) he is entitled to a new trial because the district court errone-

ously excluded certain defense evidence; and (4) his sentence should be vacated and remanded because the district court erroneously calculated his sentence. For the following reasons, we affirm.

BACKGROUND

Thomas Venezia owned B&H Vending/Ace Music Corporation ("B&H"), a vending and amusement business, and operated an illegal video gambling business through a pattern of racketeering activities and illegal gambling payouts, in violation of state and federal anti-gambling and racketeering laws. Venezia hired Amiel Cueto, an attorney, to represent him as well as to defend the tavern owners associated with B&H in the event of any arrests and/or criminal charges for their participation in the illegal gambling operation. In March of 1995, Venezia and B&H were indicted on federal racketeering charges, in addition to other related charges including illegal gambling.[1] Throughout the investigation and prior to Venezia's indictment, Cueto served as Venezia's lawyer and advisor. Cueto was not Venezia's attorney of record during the trial; nonetheless, the record indicates that Venezia continued to rely on Cueto's advice throughout the prosecution of the racketeering case.

On December 2, 1995, Venezia and B&H were convicted of racketeering, illegal gambling, and conspiracy arising out of the operation of the illegal gambling business. *United States v. B&H Vending/Ace Music Corp. & Thomas Venezia, et al.*, No. 95-30024. Seven months later, another federal grand jury returned a second indictment naming

---

[1] The charges alleged that B&H supplied video poker games to various liquor-selling establishments on which the tavern owners provided illegal gambling payouts to its customers. B&H then reimbursed the tavern owners for the money they paid out on the video games and shared with the owners any profits the games earned.

Cueto, Venezia, and Robert Romanik, a local public official and investigator who worked for Cueto and Venezia. They were charged with, *inter alia*: (1) conspiracy to defraud the United States, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371, and (2) obstruction of justice, in violation of the omnibus clause of 18 U.S.C. § 1503, for their conduct throughout the investigation of Venezia and his illegal gambling operation and the indictment and prosecution of the racketeering case. This second indictment is the impetus for the current appeal.

To understand the context of the instant indictment, convictions, and appeal, we examine the nature and scope of Cueto's relationship with Venezia, his association with the illegal gambling operation, and his involvement in the investigation, indictment, and prosecution of Venezia, the illegal gambling operation, and the racketeering enterprise. In 1987, Venezia purchased a vending and amusement business, later known as B&H, which operated an illegal video gambling business for about eight years. B&H supplied video poker games to local bars in the metropolitan area of East St. Louis, Illinois, including a Veterans of Foreign Wars Post ("VFW") on Scott Air Force Base, and the tavern owners agreed to make illegal gambling payouts to its customers.[2] State agents believed the video games were being used for illegal gambling purposes, and beginning in 1992, the Illinois Liquor Control Commission ("ILCC") and the State Police initiated a joint investigation in St. Clair County, which targeted illegal gambling operations in Southern Illinois.

The ILCC has broad investigatory powers to supervise liquor licensees, and ILCC Agent Bonds Robinson worked on the task force and investigated the gambling operations in cooperation with the state police. Initially, Robinson

---

[2] Video games that swallow pocket change and "pay off" in game replays are unobjectionable; but if the owner of an establishment pays winners in cash or liquor, then it is a violation of Illinois anti-gambling laws.

worked in a non-undercover capacity as part of the state investigation to determine, in the course of routine liquor inspections, whether any establishment was making illegal gambling payouts. Agents of the ILCC began to strictly enforce the gambling regulations and frequently visited the taverns to ensure compliance. Eventually, the FBI became interested in the state's investigation, and ultimately decided to use Robinson in a federal investigation of illegal gambling operations in St. Clair County, particularly Venezia's gambling operation.[3] At some later point, Robinson assumed an undercover role for the FBI as a corrupt liquor agent in an attempt to gather evidence against Venezia and B&H. Soon thereafter, the state police raided the VFW Post, seized B&H's video poker games, and arrested two VFW employees for maintaining an illegal gambling establishment. After the raid, Venezia and B&H supplied additional video games to the VFW, which continued to provide its customers with illegal gambling payouts.

In an attempt to gather evidence Robinson, who was present at the VFW raid, indicated that Venezia could avoid further interruptions of his illegal gambling operation if he were to offer a bribe to discourage the investigation and the interference, and he suggested to Venezia that they meet. Venezia consulted with Cueto, who instructed Venezia to meet with Tom Daley, one of his law partners at the time. In an attempt to portray Robinson as a dishonest agent, Daley reported to the ILCC that Robinson had solicited a bribe at the VFW. A meeting was then scheduled between Venezia and Robinson, who met at B&H corporate headquarters. Robinson taped the conversation at the FBI's request, and the tape was introduced into

---

[3] When the FBI decided to use Robinson in its investigation of the illegal gambling operations, he was already working for the FBI in an undercover capacity in an unrelated investigation involving illegal prostitution and racketeering.

evidence in the racketeering case and at Cueto's trial.[4] Soon after the meeting, the VFW was raided again; B&H video poker games were seized, and two employees were arrested. The ILCC issued an administrative violation to the VFW as well as a warning to remove the illegal gambling machines, otherwise, its liquor license would be revoked. Again, Venezia consulted with Cueto about the raids, the criminal charges, and the prosecutions, and they discussed available options and courses of action.

First, Cueto and Venezia drafted a letter, detailing Robinson's alleged "corrupt" conduct and accusing him of soliciting bribes, and delivered it to St. Clair County State's Attorney Robert Haida. Cueto also filed a complaint in state court against Robinson, in which Cueto alleged that Robinson was a corrupt agent. *See Venezia v. Robinson*, No. 92-CH 299. Cueto obtained a court order that required Robinson to appear for a hearing in *People v. Moore*, one of the gambling prosecutions arising from the VFW raid.[5] Pursuant to the order, Robinson appeared in state court, and Cueto immediately served him with a subpoena, which required him to appear in court within fifteen minutes for an injunction hearing in *Venezia v. Robinson*. Cueto had prepared a petition, requesting either a temporary restraining order or a preliminary and permanent injunction against alleged extortion and other vexation to prevent Robinson from interfering with the operation of Venezia's business. Robinson had not seen a copy of the complaint, had not been served with process, and was not represented by counsel.

---

[4] Of course, the defendant and the government have conflicting opinions about the substance of the conversation and whether a bribe was solicited for investigatory or criminal purposes.

[5] At trial, Cueto admitted that he obtained the court order for unlawful purposes and that he fraudulently used the court order to lure Robinson to court for the injunction proceedings. *See* Trial Transcript, Volume 27 at 72-73, 95 (hereinafter all references to the transcript of the trial are cited as "Transcript, Volume: Page").

At the hearing, Robinson's requests for an attorney were denied, and the state court judge permitted Cueto to question Robinson about the FBI's investigation (which at that point was still a covert operation) and the evidence it had obtained in the course of the investigation. Without permitting Robinson to put on a defense and without articulating any findings of fact or conclusions of law, the state court entered a preliminary injunction against Robinson, which indefinitely enjoined him from interfering with Venezia's business operations. Venezia then returned to the VFW, as well as other taverns affiliated with the gambling operation, to advise them that a state court judge had entered an injunction against Robinson and that he could no longer interfere with their establishments and the illegal gambling operation.

Notwithstanding the injunction and pursuant to instructions from the Director of ILCC to continue his routine liquor inspections, Robinson visited another establishment associated with B&H's gambling operation and discovered that the tavern owner was providing illegal gambling payouts on some of the video machines. Thereafter, Dorothy McCaw was arrested for operating and maintaining an illegal gambling establishment, and she signed a written confession for her participation in illegal gambling activities. Upon learning of the inspection and arrest, Venezia contacted Cueto, who arranged for Venezia and Romanik, the third individual charged in the instant indictment, to obtain another statement from McCaw. Cueto then drafted a letter to the ILCC, State's Attorney Haida, the Office of the United States Attorney for the Southern District of Illinois, and the FBI, claiming that his client was suffering damage as a result of Robinson's "unlawful" interference with the operation of Venezia's business and threatened that if the conduct continued, he would file suit against the ILCC, in addition to Robinson, for damages incurred. Without McCaw's knowledge, Cueto attached to that letter the statement she had given to Venezia and Romanik, which supported Cueto's allegations of interference. Cueto also

filed a rule to show cause in state court, which described Robinson's violations of the injunction and requested the court to find him in contempt; McCaw's statement also was attached to the rule to show cause, again without her knowledge.

Represented by the Office of the United States Attorney for the Southern District of Illinois, Robinson filed a motion to remove the rule to show cause in *Venezia v. Robinson* to federal district court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1442(a)(1). In the removal proceeding, the district court determined that Robinson had been working for the FBI under the control of a federal agent during the VFW raids, which therefore established federal jurisdiction. After removal, the district court dissolved the injunction and dismissed the complaint. *Venezia v. Robinson*, No. 92 CV 867. Cueto filed an appeal in this court, challenging the dissolution of the injunction and the dismissal of the complaint. Recognizing that the injunction hearing had violated Robinson's rights to due process, we affirmed the district court's order. *Venezia v. Robinson*, 16 F.3d 209 (7th Cir. 1994). Cueto filed a petition for certiorari in the Supreme Court, which also was denied. *See* 513 U.S. 815 (1994).

During the investigation, the record indicates that Cueto and Venezia developed more than a professional attorney-client relationship, entering into various financial transactions and business deals, some of which involved secret partnerships. A few examples include: (1) they purchased unimproved real estate, developed the real estate, built and managed a topless nightclub (Club Exposed), which operated some of B&H's illegal gambling machines; (2) Venezia and Cueto incorporated Millennium III, an asbestos removal company, and applied for and obtained a $600,000 line of credit to complete the purchase acquisition; and (3) Venezia purchased Cueto's office building and moved B&H corporate headquarters into it. The record demonstrates that in order to obtain financing, Venezia reported B&H as a principal asset on his financial statements and loan applications to establish the necessary

credit he and Cueto needed to become joint borrowers on various loans. Moreover, the record indicates that the lender in the Millennium purchase relied upon Venezia's financial statement in its decision to loan the money for the acquisition. *See* Transcript, 19:112-113.

About the time the Millennium purchase was finalized, state police and Robinson arrested George Vogt, a B&H customer, for gambling. At a hearing in the state's prosecution of Vogt, Robinson testified and Cueto cross-examined him. After the hearing, Cueto again approached State's Attorney Haida, provided him with the transcripts from the *Vogt* hearing, and urged Haida to indict Robinson for perjury. Thereafter, Haida commenced an investigation of Robinson's activities. Nothing came of Cueto's allegations of perjury, and the investigation ended without any charges being filed.

The investigation of Venezia and B&H began in early 1992, and the events discussed above occurred over a period of approximately three years. We briefly mentioned some of the initial business and financial dealings between Venezia and Cueto, but to avoid an even longer discussion of these background facts, we think it unnecessary to specifically discuss every financial transaction contained in the record except to point out that together Venezia and Cueto participated in various business transactions, in which millions of dollars exchanged hands to finance the purchases of various real estate interests and construction costs relating to various development projects, including certain gambling operations.[6] The indictment specifically charged that Club Exposed, the nightclub owned by Venezia and Cueto, Millennium III, as well as other business transactions in which they were involved, depended upon the continued operation of B&H and the illegal

---

[6] The government submitted a summary exhibit of the joint business transactions engaged in by Venezia and Cueto from 1991 until 1995. *See* Trial Exhibit # 276.

gambling business to secure and to cover the various loans and debts they incurred in their financial ventures.

Even after Cueto became a business partner of Venezia and invested in various real estate and development projects with him, he continued to give Venezia legal advice. Although Cueto was not an attorney of record, he participated in the preparation of Venezia's defense in the racketeering prosecution. Cueto continued to urge State's Attorney Haida to indict Robinson for perjury. He also contacted Congressman Jerry Costello, who owned an equal one-third partnership interest in a gambling development project with Cueto and Venezia, and asked the Congressman to contact Haida and to offer him a seat on the judiciary in exchange for Haida's recommendation that Cueto be appointed as the next State's Attorney. Cueto also began to publish a newspaper, the *East Side Review,* and authored an article in which he indicated that in the next election he intended to run for St. Clair County State's Attorney, and in the event he was elected, he would prosecute Robinson.[7]

In August of 1994, the government empaneled a grand jury to examine the evidence obtained in the FBI's investigation of Venezia and B&H, and the grand jury also initiated its own investigation of these allegations. In response, Cueto prepared and filed various motions to hinder the investigation and to discharge the grand jury, all of which were denied. Notwithstanding the defense tactics and delays, the grand jury indicted Venezia, among others; he was prosecuted, and ultimately, convicted for operating an illegal gambling enterprise, in addition to other related convictions.

---

[7] In the *East Side Review*, Cueto also authored and published various articles in which he complained of prosecutorial misconduct in association with the racketeering case and attacked the integrity and reputations of various Assistant United States Attorneys involved in the indictment and prosecution of the racketeering case.

Seven months after the racketeering convictions in July of 1996, another grand jury returned a separate nine count indictment against Cueto, Venezia, and Romanik. It is this indictment and the subsequent convictions on various counts of this indictment that are the subject of this appeal.[8] Count 1 of the indictment charged Cueto in a three-part conspiracy to defraud the United States, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371, alleging that he misused his office as an attorney and unlawfully and intentionally conspired with Venezia and Romanik to impede, impair, obstruct, and defeat the lawful function of the FBI, the grand jury, and the federal district court in connection with the investigation, indictment, and prosecution of Venezia, B&H, and the illegal gambling operation and racketeering enterprise. The indictment alleged that Cueto and Venezia's business relationship created Cueto's financial motive for his participation in the conspiracy, in which he endeavored to protect the illegal gambling enterprise and to maintain its continued operation in order to safeguard his personal financial interests.

In the first part of the conspiracy, the government charged that Cueto conspired to impede and delay the FBI investigation primarily by attacking the reputation of ILCC Agent Bonds Robinson and by urging the St. Clair County State's Attorney to investigate, indict, and prosecute Robinson for alleged extortion. Second, the indictment alleged that Cueto conspired to influence and hinder the function of the grand jury by filing false motions, which attacked

---

[8] For purposes of this opinion, we only discuss the counts for which Cueto was convicted: Counts 1, 2, 6, and 7. Cueto was acquitted of the charges in Counts 3, 4, and 8. Romanik pleaded guilty to Count 5 of the instant indictment for lying to the grand jury. Pursuant to a deal made with the government, Venezia pleaded guilty to the crimes charged in the indictment and testified at Cueto's trial in exchange for the government's recommendation that his 15 year sentence in the illegal gambling and racketeering case be reduced to the lower end of the Sentencing Guidelines, which would result in a reduction from 15 years to 10 years.

the operations of the FBI and the Office of the United States Attorney, in an attempt to delay and disrupt the investigation and to discharge the grand jury. Finally, the third aspect of the conspiracy focused on Cueto's attempts to obstruct the proceedings in federal district court by persuading Venezia's (and his co-defendants') defense counsel to file various motions, including a motion to disqualify the district court judge assigned to hear the racketeering case.

Counts 2, 6, and 7 of the indictment charged obstruction of justice in violation of the omnibus clause of 18 U.S.C. § 1503,[9] alleging that Cueto corruptly endeavored to use his office as an attorney to influence, obstruct, and impair the due administration of justice in various court proceedings in connection with the prosecution of Venezia, his illegal gambling operation, and the racketeering enterprise in *United States v. B&H Vending/Ace Music Corp. & Thomas Venezia, et al.* Specifically, Count 2 of the indictment charged that Cueto corruptly endeavored to influence the due administration of justice in *Venezia v. Robinson* by filing or causing to be filed pleadings in connection with the proceedings in federal district court, an appellate brief in this court, and a petition for certiorari to the United States Supreme Court. Count 6 involved Cueto's actions in regard to ILCC Agent Bonds Robinson, and the indictment charged that Cueto corruptly endeavored to obstruct the lawful function of the federal grand jury in his attempts to encourage and to persuade State's Attorney Haida to indict Robinson. Count 7 also focused on the filing of various court papers, and the indictment alleged that Cueto corruptly endeavored to influence, obstruct, and impede the proceedings in federal district court by preparing and filing and urging defense counsel to prepare and file false pleadings and court papers in connection with the racketeering case.

---

[9] Hereinafter, all statutory references are to Title 18 of the United States Code unless otherwise indicated.

After a jury trial, Cueto was convicted of the charges in Counts 1, 2, 6, and 7 and the district court ordered him to serve a prison term of 87 months, to be followed by two years of supervised release, and imposed monetary penalties. Cueto filed a timely notice of appeal. He asserts several arguments on appeal, challenging his convictions and sentence. First, Cueto contends that the conviction for conspiracy to defraud the government is invalid, arguing that: (1) the meaning of "conspiracy to defraud" in § 371 is unconstitutionally vague as applied to the conduct charged in the indictment; and (2) his conviction may rest on a constitutionally or legally invalid theory because the conduct charged in the indictment includes lawful conduct that was undertaken openly and in public view. Next, Cueto challenges each conviction for obstruction of justice in violation of the omnibus clause of § 1503 as invalid, arguing that: (1) the omnibus clause of § 1503 is unconstitutionally vague as applied to the conduct charged in the indictment; (2) the omnibus clause of § 1503 does not cover either the filing of court papers or attempts to encourage a state prosecutor to investigate another state official for misconduct; (3) the conduct charged fails to satisfy the nexus requirement as articulated by the Supreme Court in *United States v. Aguilar*, 515 U.S. 593 (1995); and (4) an attempt to persuade a prosecutor to take action against a state officer for misconduct is speech protected by the First Amendment.

Cueto also asserts that he is entitled to a new trial because the district court erred when it excluded certain defense evidence: (1) the transcript of the state injunction hearing in *Venezia v. Robinson*; (2) Robinson's testimony at a hearing in one of the state's gambling prosecutions, *People v. Vogt*, arising from Venezia's illegal gambling operation; and (3) Venezia's grand jury testimony, which Cueto wanted to use for impeachment purposes. He also claims that the district court erred by redacting portions of certain documents and newspaper articles. Finally, Cueto ar-

gues that his sentence should be vacated and remanded because the district court judge erroneously calculated his sentence by not grouping the obstruction of justice convictions. With these facts as background, we now consider the issues presented for review and examine each argument in turn.

ANALYSIS

Before we begin our analysis, we discuss the appropriate standard of review, our particular role in this review, and the limited scope of this decision. Our ruling today does not interfere with legitimate avenues of advocacy of even the most zealous of attorneys; we do nothing more than consider the constitutionality of certain criminal statutes aimed at protecting the sanctity and integrity of our justice system from corrupt influences and apply them in a sober and impartial fashion. Ultimately, we consider the sufficiency of evidence presented by the prosecution in our review of the jury's guilty verdict. Appellate review of a jury's verdict is limited; if any rational trier of fact could have found the elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt, we are bound to affirm the verdict. *Jackson v. Virginia*, 443 U.S. 307, 319 (1979). We have repeatedly recognized that defendants challenging the sufficiency of the evidence at trial face a "nearly insurmountable hurdle." *See, e.g., United States v. Moore*, 115 F.3d 1348, 1363 (7th Cir. 1997) (citing other cases).

In reviewing the sufficiency of the evidence in a criminal case, "the relevant question is whether, after viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecution, *any* rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt." *Jackson*, 443 U.S. at 319 (emphasis in original); *see also United States v. Jackson*, 103 F.3d 561, 567 (7th Cir. 1996). We defer to the jury's credibility determinations, its weighing of the evidence, and its drawing of reasonable inferences and overturn a verdict only when the record contains no

evidence, regardless of how it is weighed, from which a jury could find guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. *Moore*, 115 F.3d at 1363. With that said, we recognize that the defendant asserts various other arguments challenging his convictions and sentence, and we discuss those standards of review at the point in our analysis when we consider those alternative arguments.

I. Obstruction of Justice

Cueto asserts several arguments with respect to his convictions on Counts 2, 6, and 7 for obstruction of justice, contending that the omnibus clause of § 1503 is unconstitutionally vague as applied to the conduct charged in the indictment and, alternatively, that the evidence established at trial on these counts is insufficient to support his convictions. We address each argument in turn and begin with the constitutional challenges. Cueto argues that "much of what lawyers *do*—are attempts to influence the justice system," and that the omnibus clause of § 1503 was not intended to apply to the type of conduct charged in the indictment. Appellant's Brief at 17 (emphasis in original). Questions regarding the constitutionality or scope of a statute are reviewed *de novo*. *Village of Hoffman Estates v. The Flipside, Hoffman Estates, Inc.*, 455 U.S. 489, 497-98 (1982).

"[I]n determining the scope of a statute, one is to look first at its language. If the language is unambiguous, ordinarily it is to be regarded as conclusive unless there is 'a clearly expressed legislative intent to the contrary.'" *Dickerson v. New Banner Institute, Inc.*, 460 U.S. 103, 110 (1983) (internal citations omitted) (quoting *Consumer Product Safety Comm'n v. GTE Sylvania, Inc.*, 447 U.S. 102, 108 (1980)). The omnibus clause of § 1503 is a catch-all provision that states:

> Whoever . . . *corruptly* or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstructs, or impedes or *endeavors* to influence, obstruct

> or impede, the due administration of law, shall be imprisoned . . . .

18 U.S.C. § 1503 (emphasis added). This clause was intended to ensure that criminals could not circumvent the statute's purpose "by devising novel and creative schemes that would interfere with the administration of justice but would nonetheless fall outside the scope of § 1503's specific prohibitions." *United States v. Tackett*, 113 F.3d 603, 607 (6th Cir. 1997). "The obstruction of justice statute was drafted with an eye to 'the variety of corrupt methods by which the proper administration of justice may be impeded or thwarted, a variety limited only by the imagination of the criminally inclined.'" *United States v. Griffin*, 589 F.2d 200, 206 (5th Cir. 1979) (citation omitted).

Cueto also contends that the vagueness problems are exacerbated by this court's broad construction of the term "corruptly," arguing that it fails to provide meaningful and adequate notice as to what conduct is proscribed by the statute. The Seventh Circuit has approved a jury instruction which articulates a definition for the term "corruptly," and the district court judge included this definition in its instructions to the jury:

> Corruptly means to act with the purpose of obstructing justice. The United States is not required to prove that the defendant's only or even main purpose was to obstruct the due administration of justice. The government only has to establish that the defendant should have reasonably seen that the natural and probable consequences of his acts was the obstruction of justice. Intent may be inferred from all of the surrounding facts and circumstances. Any act, by any party, whether lawful or unlawful on its face, may violate Section 1503, if performed with a corrupt motive.

See Transcript, 32:68-69. The mere fact that a term "covers a broad spectrum of conduct" does not render it vague, and the requirement that a statute must give fair notice as to what conduct is proscribed "cannot be used as a shield by

one who is already bent on serious wrongdoing." *Griffin*, 589 F.2d at 206-207.

There is little case authority directly on point to consider whether an attorney acting in his professional capacity could be criminally liable under the omnibus clause of § 1503 for traditional litigation-related conduct that results in an obstruction of justice. "Correct application of Section 1503 thus requires, in a very real sense, that the factfinder discern—by direct evidence or from inference—the motive which led an individual to perform particular actions. . . . 'Intent may make any otherwise innocent act criminal, if it is a step in a plot.'" *United States v. Cintolo*, 818 F.2d 980, 991 (1st Cir. 1987) (quoting *Badders v. United States*, 240 U.S. 391, 394 (1916)). Therefore, it is not the means employed by the defendant that are specifically prohibited by the statute; instead, it is the defendant's corrupt endeavor which motivated the action. Otherwise lawful conduct, even acts undertaken by an attorney in the course of representing a client, can transgress § 1503 if employed with the corrupt intent to accomplish that which the statute forbids. *See Cintolo*, 818 F.2d at 992 ("means, though lawful in themselves, can cross the line of illegality if (i) employed with a corrupt motive, (ii) to hinder the due administration of justice, so long as (iii) the means have the capacity to obstruct").

We are not persuaded by Cueto's constitutional challenges, and his focus is misplaced. The government's theory of prosecution is predicated on the fact that Cueto held a personal financial interest in protecting the illegal gambling enterprise, which formed the requisite corrupt intent for his conduct to qualify as violations of the statute.[10] Cueto

---

[10] This theory of prosecution brings us some pause. With the government's emphasis on Cueto's involvement in Venezia's illegal gambling operation and the racketeering enterprise, we are puzzled why the government did not indict and prosecute Cueto in the underlying racketeering case for his participation in the

(continued...)

focuses entirely on the legality of his conduct, and not the requisite criminal intent proscribed by § 1503. It is undisputed that an attorney may use any *lawful* means to defend his client, and there is no risk of criminal liability if those means employed by the attorney in his endeavors to represent his client remain within the scope of lawful conduct. However, it is the corrupt endeavor to protect the illegal gambling operation and to safeguard his own financial interest, which motivated Cueto's otherwise legal conduct, that separates his conduct from that which is legal.

Even though courts may be hesitant, with good reason and caution, to include traditional litigation-related conduct within the scope of § 1503, the omnibus clause has been interpreted broadly in accordance with congressional intent to promote the due administration of justice and to prevent the miscarriage of justice, and an individual's status as an attorney engaged in litigation-related conduct does not provide protection from prosecution for criminal conduct. *Aguilar*, 515 U.S. at 599; *see also United States v. Goulding*, 26 F.3d 656, 665 (7th Cir. 1994); *Cintolo*, 818 F.2d at 990 ("a criminal lawyer has no license to act as a lawyer-criminal"). Cueto's arguments have no merit. As a lawyer, he possessed a heightened awareness of the law and its scope, and he cannot claim lack of fair notice as to what conduct is proscribed by § 1503 to shield himself from criminal liability, particularly when he was already "bent on serious wrongdoing." *Griffin*, 589 F.2d at 206-207. More so than an ordinary individual, an attorney, in particular a criminal defense attorney, has a sophisticated understanding of the type of conduct that constitutes criminal

---

[10] (...continued)
illegal gambling operation. Although the government's decision not to prosecute Cueto in the previous case is fundamentally inconsequential to the instant appeal, we are concerned about the relationship between the instant appeal and the underlying prosecution of the gambling operation and the racketeering enterprise.

violations of the law. There is a discernable difference between an honest lawyer who unintentionally submits a false statement to the court and an attorney with specific corrupt intentions who files papers in bad faith knowing that they contain false representations and/or inaccurate facts in an attempt to hinder judicial proceedings. It is true that, to a certain extent, a lawyer's conduct influences judicial proceedings, or at least attempts to affect the outcome of the proceedings. However, that influence stems from a lawyer's attempt to advocate his client's interests *within the scope of the law*. It is the "corrupt endeavor" to influence the due administration of justice that is the heart of the offense, and Cueto's personal financial interest is the heart of his corrupt motive.

An amicus brief submitted by the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers ("Association") also questions the proper scope of the omnibus clause of § 1503, and the Association articulates its fears that if we affirm Cueto's convictions, criminal defense attorneys will be subject to future prosecutions not only for actual misconduct, but also for apparent and inadvertent wrongdoing, notwithstanding a lawyer's good faith advocacy. The Association believes that this type of sweeping prosecution will sufficiently chill vigorous advocacy and eventually destroy the delicate balance between prosecution and defense which is necessary to maintain the effective operation of the criminal justice system. Although the Association discusses valid policy concerns and asserts legitimate arguments, some of which we generally agree with, we are also concerned with the flipside of its argument. If lawyers are not punished for their criminal conduct and corrupt endeavors to manipulate the administration of justice, the result would be the same: the weakening of an ethical adversarial system and the undermining of just administration of the law. We have the responsibility to ensure that the integrity of the criminal justice system is maintained and that protection includes granting to both the prosecution and the defense flexibility and "discretion in the conduct of the trial and

the presentation of evidence," *Imbler v. Pachtman*, 424 U.S. 409, 426 (1976), in addition to enforcing mechanisms of punishment, which necessarily include criminal prosecution, to prevent abuses of the system.

We have carefully examined the fears articulated by the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, in addition to the arguments put forth by the defendant, that a decision upholding the application of the omnibus clause of § 1503 to litigation-related conduct may deter or somehow chill the criminal defense lawyers in zealous advocacy, and we find those concerns to be exaggerated, at least as considered in light of the facts in the present case. Although we appreciate that it is of significant importance to avoid chilling vigorous advocacy and to maintain the balance of effective representation, we also recognize that a lawyer's misconduct and criminal acts are not absolutely immune from prosecution. We cannot ignore Cueto's corrupt endeavors to manipulate the administration of justice and his clear criminal violations of the law. As the First Circuit recognized in *Cintolo*:

> Nothing in the caselaw, fairly read, suggests that lawyers should be plucked gently from the maddening crowd and sheltered from the rigors of 18 U.S.C. § 1503 in the manner urged by appellant and by the amici. Nor is there sufficient public policy justification favoring such a result. To the contrary, the overriding public policy interest is that "[t]he attorney-client relationship cannot . . . be used to shield or promote illegitimate acts. . . ." "[A]ttorneys, just like all other persons, . . . are not above the law and are subject to its full application under appropriate circumstances."

818 F.2d at 993-94 (internal citations omitted). Accordingly, we conclude that the omnibus clause of § 1503 may be used to prosecute a lawyer's litigation-related criminality and that neither the omnibus clause of § 1503 nor this court's construction of the term "corruptly" is unconstitutionally vague as applied to the conduct charged in the indictment for which Cueto was convicted.

We now turn to Cueto's argument that his convictions on the obstruction of justice counts were not supported by sufficient evidence. Cueto's task is a formidable one, and an examination of the record illuminates that the evidence presented in this case overwhelmingly supports the jury's verdict. In order to establish a violation of § 1503, the government must demonstrate that: (1) there was a pending judicial proceeding; (2) the defendant knew of the proceeding; (3) he influenced, obstructed, or impeded, or endeavored to influence, obstruct or impede the due administration of justice; and (4) he did so corruptly. *United States v. Maloney*, 71 F.3d 645, 656 (7th Cir. 1995). There must be a nexus between the defendant's efforts and the judicial proceeding sought to be corruptly influenced. *Aguilar*, 515 U.S. at 598-599. However, a defendant's actions need not be successful in order to be prosecuted under the statute. All that is required is that the defendant has knowledge or notice that his actions are likely to affect the just administration of the subject proceedings. *Id.*

Again the focus of Cueto's argument is misplaced; he argues that his conduct does not fall within the scope of the omnibus clause of § 1503 and that the government presented insufficient evidence to demonstrate his guilt. Cueto, however, fails to address the essence of the government's allegations and, ultimately, the basis for his convictions; it is his corrupt endeavor to obstruct the administration of justice that transforms his traditional litigation-related conduct into criminal violations of the law. The gloss which Cueto places on the evidence manifestly misapprehends both the jury's fact finding function and our role in the review of the verdict. In light of the considerable circumstantial evidence in support of its assessment of the situation, the jury was reasonably entitled to disbelieve Cueto's characterization of his conduct and to accept the contrary interpretation urged by the government that Cueto, with a corrupt purpose, endeavored to obstruct the due administration of justice. That finding cannot be lightly overturned. Indeed, the record adequately

supports the conclusion that Cueto's conduct, though nominally litigation-related conduct on behalf of his client, was undertaken with the corrupt intent to protect Venezia, Venezia's associates, and his business from criminal prosecution and to safeguard his personal financial interest in the illegal gambling operation, whatever the costs and consequences to the due administration of justice.

The charges in Count 2 of the indictment included allegations of a corrupt endeavor to obstruct the due administration of justice in *Venezia v. Robinson* by filing pleadings in federal district court and a continued attempt to hinder the proceedings by filing an appeal in this court and a petition for certiorari in the United States Supreme Court. The evidence demonstrates that Cueto successfully exposed the FBI's investigation, uncovered the evidence it had gathered, obtained the injunction against Robinson, and continued to file frivolous appeals after the district court dismissed the injunction and the complaint. *See* Transcript, 15:62-63; 16:71-72. Government agents, in fact, testified that the investigation was disrupted and that Cueto "blew the lid off the ongoing investigation." *See* Transcript, 3:44; 16:55-59. The jury was amply justified in concluding that Cueto's repeated filings were motivated by his attempt to protect his client from prosecution and to safeguard his financial interest. Cueto's actions may qualify as traditional litigation-related conduct in form, but not in substance, and the evidence presented at trial demonstrates that Cueto clearly intended and corruptly endeavored to obstruct the due administration of justice in *Venezia v. Robinson*.

Similar to Count 2, Count 7 includes allegations of preparing and filing and causing defense counsel to prepare and file false pleadings and other court papers; the indictment specifically charged Cueto with encouraging defense counsel in the racketeering case to file false motions and pleadings for the purpose of impeding and obstructing the administration of justice in that case. We have no doubt that Cueto in fact intended to interfere with the investiga-

tion, attempted to delay the indictment, and endeavored to obstruct the proceedings in federal district court in connection with the prosecution of Venezia. *See* Transcript, 23:74; 25:17. We simply are not dealing with non-corrupt, legitimate involvement in the preparation of Venezia's (and his co-defendants') defense. Nor are we dealing with inadvertent interference. From the evidence presented at trial, the jury was amply justified in concluding without a doubt that Cueto corruptly endeavored to obstruct the district court's proceedings in the gambling and racketeering prosecution.

In response to his conviction on Count 6, Cueto argues that his conviction should be reversed because the *Aguilar* nexus is absent; he contends that the government presented insufficient evidence to establish the relationship between his attempts to persuade State's Attorney Haida to investigate and indict Robinson and a pending judicial proceeding.[11] Cueto contends that at the time the conduct charged in the indictment occurred, the grand jury had not yet been empaneled and that Venezia had not been indicted in the racketeering case, and therefore the nexus is lacking. His argument, however, mischaracterizes the frame of time at issue in addition to the indictment and the charges therein. "It is well established that investiga-

---

[11] Cueto also asserts an alternative argument that his attempts to persuade the local prosecutor to indict a state official for misconduct are protected by the First Amendment. Speech which is false and misleading is not protected by the First Amendment's right to freedom of speech. *Herbert v. Lando*, 441 U.S. 153, 171 (1979); *United States v. Walton*, 36 F.3d 32, 35 (7th Cir. 1994). Just as false statements are not immunized by the First Amendment, meritless litigation based on false accusations and criminal intentions does not fall within the scope of protected speech and "is not immunized by the First Amendment right to petition." *Bill Johnson's Restaurants, Inc. v. NLRB*, 461 U.S. 731, 743 (1983). Cueto fails to show that his conduct is entitled to First Amendment protection; Cueto's conduct is not the kind of conduct with even a colorable claim to First Amendment protection and his argument must fail.

tions undertaken with the intention of presenting evidence before a grand jury are sufficient to constitute 'the due administration of justice' under § 1503." *Maloney*, 71 F.3d at 657.

Though Cueto's initial calls and letters to State's Attorney Haida may pre-date the empaneling of the grand jury, the phone call to Congressman Costello occurred after the indictment was unsealed. In addition, his letters to the State's Attorney occurred throughout the investigation, and the evidence indicates that Cueto knew of the investigation. Accordingly, Cueto's conduct prior to the empaneling of the grand jury as well as his subsequent acts to encourage State's Attorney Haida to investigate and prosecute Agent Robinson have the requisite nexus to the judicial proceedings; there was sufficient evidence presented at trial for a rational trier of fact to conclude beyond doubt that Cueto repeatedly attempted to urge Haida to prosecute Robinson knowing that an investigation into Robinson's conduct would hinder the government's ability to continue to investigate Venezia and the gambling operation.

Whatever the contours of the line between traditional lawyering and criminal conduct, they must inevitably be drawn case-by-case. We refuse to accept the notion that lawyers may do anything, including violating the law, to zealously advocate their clients' interests and then avoid criminal prosecution by claiming that they were "just doing their job." As the First Circuit stated in *Cintolo*, "[w]e refuse to chip some sort of special exception for lawyers into the brickwork of § 1503." 818 F.2d at 996. We respect the importance of allowing defense counsel to perform legitimate activities without hindrance and recognize the potential dangers that could arise if prosecutors were permitted to inquire into the motives of criminal defense attorneys ad hoc. This case, however, does not create that avenue of inquiry; our conclusion is limited to the specific facts of this case. Viewing the facts and inferences most favorably to the government, as we are required to do, there was ample basis for the jury to find that Cueto

corruptly endeavored to obstruct the due administration of justice. The jury was justified in concluding that Cueto had the requisite knowledge of the FBI's investigation of Venezia, the grand jury's inquiry, and the district court's proceedings and then acted in a manner that had the natural and probable effect of interfering with the lawful function of those governmental entities and the due administration of justice. His role as a defense attorney did not insulate him from the criminal consequences of his corruptly-motivated actions. Accordingly, we affirm Cueto's convictions on Counts 2, 6, and 7.

II. CONSPIRACY TO DEFRAUD THE UNITED STATES

Cueto next challenges his conviction on Count 1 for conspiring to defraud the United States in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371, arguing that the statute is unconstitutionally vague as applied to the conduct charged in the indictment. He claims that the "conspiracy to defraud" clause is void for vagueness in the instant case because neither the statutory language, the legislative history, nor the case law interpreting § 371 provides adequate notice to a person of ordinary intelligence that conduct such as that charged in the instant indictment would violate the statute. Cueto also argues that his conviction should be reversed because it may rest on a legally or constitutionally invalid theory.

Count 1 of the indictment charged Cueto with conspiracy to defraud the United States, in violation of § 371, which states:

> If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States, or to defraud the United States, or any agency thereof in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years or both.

18 U.S.C. § 371. We have recognized that the statute is broad enough in its terms to include any conspiracy for the

purpose of impairing, obstructing or defeating the lawful function of any department of the government; neither the conspiracy's goal nor the means used to achieve it need to be independently illegal. *United States v. Jackson*, 33 F.3d 866, 870 (7th Cir. 1994). To sustain a conviction for conspiracy to defraud, the record must demonstrate: (1) an agreement to accomplish an illegal objective against the United States; (2) one or more overt acts in furtherance of the illegal purpose; and (3) an intent to commit the substantive offense—in this case, the intent to obstruct justice. *United States v. Cyprian*, 23 F.3d 1189, 1202 (7th Cir. 1994). Intent, as well as the agreement, may be inferred from circumstantial evidence concerning the relationship of the parties, their overt acts, and the totality of their conduct. *United States v. Marren*, 890 F.2d 924, 933 (7th Cir. 1989).

The meaning of "conspiracy to defraud" is framed in general terms; it is impossible for Congress to anticipate, identify, and define each and every context in which an agreement to act would qualify as a conspiracy to defraud. As the Supreme Court recognized in *United States v. Lanier*, 520 U.S. 259, 117 S. Ct. 1219 (1997), "general statements of the law are not inherently incapable of giving fair and clear warning, . . . even though 'the very action in question has [not] previously been held unlawful.'" 117 S. Ct. at 1227 (quoting *Anderson v. Creighton*, 483 U.S. 635, 640 (1987)). In *Hammerschmidt v. United States*, 265 U.S. 182 (1924), the Supreme Court clarified the meaning of conspiracy to defraud:

> To conspire to defraud the United States means . . . to interfere with or obstruct one of its lawful governmental functions by deceit, craft or trickery, or at least by means that are dishonest. It is not necessary that the Government shall be subjected to property or pecuniary loss by the fraud, but only that its legitimate official action and purpose shall be defeated by misrepresentation, chicane, or the overreaching of those charged with carrying out the governmental intention.

265 U.S. at 188. The fact that § 371 has been applied to agreements not expressly anticipated by Congress nor specifically articulated in the statute does not demonstrate ambiguity nor does it create vagueness problems. "A statute can be unambiguous without addressing every interpretative theory offered by a party. It need only be 'plain to anyone reading the Act' that the statute encompasses the conduct at issue." *Salinas v. United States*, 118 S. Ct. 469, 475 (1997) (quoting *Gregory v. Ashcroft*, 501 U.S. 452, 467 (1991)). In fact, the Second Circuit has recognized that an indictment charging a conspiracy to defraud need only articulate with particularity "the essential nature of the alleged fraud." *United States v. Helmsley*, 941 F.2d 71, 90-91 (2d Cir. 1992).

Although § 371 does not specifically articulate that Cueto's various acts, which impaired the FBI's investigation, impeded the inquiries of the grand jury, and delayed and obstructed the proceedings in the district court, fall within its scope, the instant indictment alleges with particularity "the essential nature of the alleged fraud" and identifies Cueto's specific conduct which furthered the conspiracy. The allegations in the indictment specifically describe the conduct charged as part of the essential nature of the alleged fraud, which provides the basis of Cueto's conviction for conspiracy to defraud. As applied to the conduct charged in the instant indictment, the conspiracy to defraud clause of § 371 is not unconstitutionally vague, and the plain and ordinary meaning of "conspiracy to defraud" necessarily reaches Cueto's conduct.

Cueto, however, argues that the specificity of the indictment is problematic and far-reaching because it includes non-criminal conduct, which may not properly be a valid basis for the criminal charges and, ultimately, his conviction on Count 1. Cueto contends that his conduct is lawful "lawyering conduct" and that he cannot be guilty of a conspiracy to commit acts which are not criminal. To the contrary, the record clearly demonstrates that his conduct, which necessarily includes his corrupt endeavors, was not typical conduct of a lawyer and that it certainly was not

lawful lawyering conduct. Based on our earlier determinations that there was sufficient evidence at trial to convict Cueto on the obstruction of justice charges for his litigation-related conduct, we can similarly dispose of the present argument. Although his actions initially may have stemmed from routine, even vigorous, advocacy, at some point his conduct exceeded the scope of lawful lawyering conduct. "'[A]cts which are themselves legal lose their legal character when they become constituent elements of an unlawful scheme.'" *United States v. Bucey*, 876 F.2d 1297, 1312 (7th Cir. 1989) (quoting *Continental Ore Co. v. Union Carbide & Carbon Corp.*, 370 U.S. 690, 707 (1962)). Indeed, it is evident that many of his actions were prohibited by the rules of professional responsibility and the canons of legal ethics. *See* Transcript, 22:1-114. Although those violations do not necessarily constitute criminal violations of the law, they are further evidence of an intent to participate in the conspiracy.

We recognize that Cueto may initially have been hired in his professional capacity to provide legal advice and representation, but it was equally reasonable for the jury to conclude from the evidence presented at trial that his representation also was undertaken for a criminal purpose in an attempt to protect the illegal gambling operation and to prevent government interference and that Cueto's role in the conspiracy was to use the power of his office as an attorney for the corrupt purpose of impairing, impeding, and obstructing the investigation, indictment, and prosecution of the illegal gambling and racketeering enterprise. Similarly, it was reasonable for the jury to conclude that Cueto agreed to participate in this scheme for his personal financial gain; the income generated by Venezia's illegal gambling operation was used to fund additional business ventures pursued in partnership with Cueto. Examining the evidence in the light most favorable to the government, we conclude that a rational jury could have found that the government proved the elements of § 371 beyond a reasonable doubt and that Cueto conspired with others and pur-

posefully and knowingly participated in a corrupt scheme to defraud the United States. Accordingly, we find no error with Cueto's conviction on Count 1.

III. Evidentiary Rulings of the District Court

Cueto also claims that he is entitled to a new trial based on the district court's incorrect evidentiary rulings. He challenges three specific evidentiary rulings, in which the district court excluded the transcript of the state injunction hearing in *Venezia v. Robinson* and Robinson's testimony at the *Vogt* hearing and admitted redacted portions of certain documents. We review a district court's evidentiary rulings for an abuse of discretion. *United States v. Whitaker*, 127 F.3d 595, 601 (7th Cir. 1997). The defendant has "a heavy burden in challenging a trial court's evidentiary rulings on appeal . . . ." *United States v. Briscoe*, 896 F.2d 1476, 1489-90 (7th Cir. 1990). The trial court's rulings are given special deference "because of the trial judge's first-hand exposure to the witnesses and the evidence as a whole, and because of his familiarity with the case and ability to gauge the likely impact of the evidence in the context of the entire proceeding." *United States v. Torres*, 977 F.2d 321, 329 (7th Cir. 1992). Under an abuse of discretion standard, reversal is warranted "only when the trial judge's 'decision is based on an erroneous conclusion of law or where the record contains no evidence on which he rationally could have based that decision . . . .'" *Wheeler v. Sims*, 951 F.2d 796, 802 (7th Cir. 1992) (quoting *Deitchman v. E.R. Squibb & Sons, Inc.*, 740 F.2d 556, 563-564 (7th Cir. 1984)).

Cueto first complains that the district court's decision to exclude the transcript of the injunction hearing prevented him from showing that he had a reasonable belief that Robinson was in fact a corrupt agent. The district court refused to admit the transcript of the hearing into evidence because, among other reasons, the hearing was conducted in violation of Robinson's rights as determined by this court in *Venezia v. Robinson*, 16 F.3d 209 (7th Cir. 1994).

Specifically, Robinson received notice of the injunction hearing through fraudulent pretenses created by Cueto, and the state court judge denied Robinson his right to counsel and conducted the hearing in violation of his right to due process of law. The district court recognized that Cueto should not be able to profit from his own wrongdoing and therefore excluded the transcript. We find no error with this determination.

Next, Cueto contends that the court erred by denying him the ability to present testimony to demonstrate his reasonable belief that Robinson perjured himself at the *Vogt* hearing. The record shows that the district court limited Cueto's testimony because he intended to attack Robinson's credibility and to discuss testimony Robinson had given in other court proceedings. The district court ruled that the proposed evidence was hearsay and excluded it. We agree with the district court's ruling that Cueto should not be permitted to discuss on the witness stand testimony Robinson had given in other court proceedings. FED. R. EVID. 801. The court also determined that because Robinson was never called as a witness his credibility could not be attacked. *See* Transcript, 26:120-121. We find no error in the court's decision to exclude this evidence.

Finally, Cueto argues that the redacted documents, admitted by the district court, provided an incomplete and inaccurate description of his purpose for publishing the *East Side Review* articles and his reasons for submitting various filings to the court. However, the record demonstrates that the district court redacted the various documents because in a pre-trial motion, the judge had determined that prosecutorial misconduct was not a viable defense and the documents in question included various allegations of prosecutorial misconduct and attacked the integrity of the prosecutors. The court refused to allow any discussion of or reference to allegations of governmental misconduct to be presented to the jury. Cueto disregards the record and does not address the specific grounds for the trial court's rulings on the exclusion of this evidence. We conclude that the court's decision to redact the documents was proper; ad-

mission of the documents in their entirety would have impermissibly placed allegations of prosecutorial conduct before the jury. *See United States v. Glover*, 101 F.3d 1183 (7th Cir. 1996).

For the sake of argument, even if the district court's rulings were erroneous, reversal is not required so long as the errors were harmless, and "harmful error results only if the error has a substantial and injurious effect or influence on the jury's verdict." *United States v. Schoenborn*, 4 F.3d 1424, 1429 (7th Cir. 1993). A defendant is entitled to a new trial only if there is "a reasonable possibility" that the exclusion of the evidence had "a prejudicial effect upon the jury's verdict." *United States v. Berry*, 92 F.3d 597, 600 (7th Cir. 1996). When viewed in the context of the entire trial and the totality of the evidence, the jury heard substantial evidence to support the government's theory of prosecution. The admission of the excluded evidence would not have produced a different result in this case; the jury possessed more than enough evidence to convict Cueto for conspiring to defraud the government and for obstructing the due administration of justice. Thus, even if the district court's evidentiary rulings were erroneous, the errors were harmless, and Cueto is not entitled to a new trial.

Cueto also argues that he is entitled to a new trial because the district court violated his Sixth Amendment right to confront witnesses by refusing to allow defense counsel to impeach Venezia with his grand jury testimony during cross-examination. Normally, we review a trial court's restriction on or limitation of cross-examination for an abuse of discretion. *United States v. Sasson*, 62 F.3d 874, 882 (7th Cir. 1995). However, where the restriction impacts the defendant's Sixth Amendment right to confrontation, the review is *de novo*. *Id.* "[T]he Confrontation Clause guarantees an opportunity for effective cross-examination, not cross-examination that is effective in whatever way, and to whatever extent, the defense may wish." *Delaware v. Fensterer*, 474 U.S. 15, 20 (1985). So long as cross-examination elicits adequate information to allow a jury to

assess a witness's credibility, motives, or possible bias, the Sixth Amendment is not compromised by a limitation on cross-examination. *Sasson*, 62 F.3d at 883.

On direct examination, Venezia admitted that he had perjured himself in his grand jury testimony to protect Cueto. *See* Transcript, 5:223-229. As such, the value of his grand jury testimony was limited. Nonetheless, Cueto contends that Venezia's grand jury testimony was crucial to impeach other aspects of his testimony at trial. Mere restrictions on the scope of cross-examination do not necessarily constitute a constitutional error in violation of the Confrontation Clause. *Delaware v. Van Arsdall*, 475 U.S. 673, 682 (1986). So long as defense counsel has sufficient opportunity to cross examine a witness, it is of peripheral concern to the Sixth Amendment how much opportunity counsel gets to "hammer [a] point home to the jury." *Sasson*, 62 F.3d at 882. Even though the district court excluded Venezia's grand jury testimony, Cueto had ample opportunity to demonstrate Venezia's lack of credibility during cross-examination. We therefore conclude that Cueto's Sixth Amendment right was not compromised.

IV. Sentencing Issues

Finally, Cueto contends that the district court erroneously calculated his sentence, arguing that the three counts of obstruction of justice should have been grouped pursuant to United States Sentencing Guideline § 3D1.2. We review the district court's factual determinations underlying the application of the Sentencing Guidelines for clear error. *United States v. Owolabi*, 69 F.3d 156, 162 (7th Cir. 1995). A district court's decision between two permissible choices involves resolution of facts that requires the perspective and special competence of the trial judge, and courts of appeals give due deference to the trial judge's determinations, "for it embodies the traditional exercise of discretion by a sentencing court." *Koon v. United States*, 518 U.S. 81, 98 (1996).

Section 3D1.2 requires that the sentencing judge group any count "involving the same victim and two or more acts or transactions connected by a common criminal objective or constituting part of a common scheme or plan." U.S.S.G. § 3D1.2. This section contemplates a grouping decision based on a "single course of conduct with a single criminal objective" and does not authorize the grouping of offenses that do not represent essentially one composite harm. *Id.* at Application Note 4.[12] A primary consideration in this section is whether the offenses involve different victims, and "victim" is defined as the person "who is directly and most seriously affected by the offense . . . ." *Id.* at Application Note 2. For offenses in which there are no identifiable victims, the victim for purposes of this section is the societal interest that is harmed, and the grouping decision is based on "the nature of the interest invaded by each offense." *United States v. Bruder*, 945 F.2d 167, 170 (7th Cir. 1991).

This case is a "victimless" crime, so the harm to societal interests must be considered. Cueto argues that his crimes harmed the same societal interests and fall within the scope of Sentencing Guideline § 3D1.2. Instead, the district court accepted the government's argument that different societal interests were harmed in each offense of conviction and consequently the judge considered each count separately for purposes of calculating of Cueto's sentence.[13]

The district court relied primarily on this court's decision in *United States v. Owolabi*, in which we affirmed a judge's decision not to group an immigration offense and a coun-

---

[12] For example, the same crime against the same victim on separate occasions would not be grouped because each separate crime, even though they may be identical, involves separate instances of risk of harm.

[13] By not grouping the offenses of conviction together when calculating his sentence, the district court effectively increased Cueto's sentence.

terfeit securities offense. 69 F.3d at 167. Cueto attempts to distinguish *Owolabi* from the present case, arguing that his offenses involved convictions under the same statute, unlike the conduct charged in *Owolabi* which involved separate offenses of conviction. He argues that the conduct for which he was convicted ultimately shared a common goal with a singular purpose: to obstruct the investigation, indictment, and prosecution of the illegal gambling and racketeering case. In his reply brief, Cueto emphasizes that the government characterized his actions as "a unitary effort" to prevent the government from shutting down the gambling operation, and he contends that the government cannot abandon that theory of a unitary purpose to justify the imposition of a longer sentence based upon its argument that multiple societal interests were harmed. Appellant's Reply Brief at 30.

We do not dispute Cueto's argument that the government characterized Cueto's actions as a unitary effort with a common goal, and we certainly recognize that the instant case is distinguishable from *Owolabi* because Cueto's offenses of conviction involve violations of the same statute. Notwithstanding these arguments, Cueto's conduct invaded three distinct societal interests—the proper functioning of the FBI, the grand jury, and the district court—and each entity has a fundamentally separate and unique governmental function. Cueto's conduct disrupted and interfered with the lawful function of various governmental entities at different times throughout a period of approximately two or three years. His purpose may have involved only one criminal objective, but it certainly did not involve a single course of action. The district court's determination that the societal interests harmed were sufficiently distinct to preclude grouping was not clearly erroneous. Therefore, we conclude that district court judge properly applied Sentencing Guideline § 3D1.2 when he calculated Cueto's sentence.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, keeping in mind the limited scope of our holding, we AFFIRM the defendant's convictions and the sentence imposed by the district court.

A true Copy:

Teste:

Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

USCA-97-C-006—Midwest Law Printing Co., Inc., Chicago—7-31-98

United States Court of Appeals

For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604

August 24, 1998.

Before

Hon. WILLIAM J. BAUER, Circuit Judge

Hon. JOEL M. FLAUM, Circuit Judge

Hon. DANIEL A. MANION, Circuit Judge

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	) Appeal from the
	) United States District
Plaintiff-Appellee,	) Court for the Southern
	) District of Illinois.
No. 97-3439 v.	)
	) No. 96 CR 30070
AMIEL CUETO,	)
	) **Stephen N.**
Defendant-Appellant.	) **Limbaugh,** Judge.

ORDER

On consideration of the petition for rehearing with suggestion for rehearing en banc filed in the above-captioned case by the defendant-appellant, all of the judges on the original panel have voted to deny and none of the judges in active service has requested a vote thereon.

Therefore, the petition for rehearing with suggestion for rehearing en banc in DENIED.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)
	)
Plaintiff,	)
	) Criminal No.
vs.	) 96-30070-SNL
	)
AMIEL CUETO, ET. AL.,	)
	)
Defendant.	)

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on defendant Cueto's motion to dismiss Counts 2 and 7, Count 3, and Counts 4 and 6 of the Indictment (#39), filed September 10, 1996. Extensive responsive pleadings have been filed by the Government and defendant Cueto.

Essentially, defendant Cueto seeks dismissal of the counts which charge him with obstruction of justice in violation of 18 U.S.C. §1503. For the most part, he argues that the indictment fails to charge him with any act that could be considered criminal under §1503. He contends that none of the acts alleged are criminal in themselves, and that there is simply no connection between the commission of these acts and any endeavor to impede or influence the 1994 and/or 1995 grand juries. The Government counters that defendant's motion is an improper attempt to prematurely assert his trial defenses; and that the Court should not address "sufficiency of evidence" issues at this time. It further contends that each of the subject counts properly avers a violation of §1503 in that every act alleged (in the subject counts) was part of a course and pattern by defendant in his "corrupt endeavor" to influence, obstruct and

impede the due administration of justice in the grand juries and judicial proceedings. The Government contends that defendant is incorrectly focusing on the "means" by which he attempted to carry out his violations of §1503, as opposed to focusing on whether the defendant had the requisite criminal "intent" to commit the §1503 violations.

Section 1503 provides:

> "Whoever corruptly, or by threats or force, or by an threatening letter or communication, endeavors to influence, intimidate, or impede any grand or petit juror, or officer in or of any court of the United States, or officer who may be serving at any examination or other proceeding before any United States magistrate judge or other committing magistrate, in the discharge of his duty, or injures any such grand or petit juror in his person or property on account of any verdict or indictment assented to by him, or on account of his being or having been such juror, or injures any such officer, magistrate judge, or other committing magistrate in his person or property on account of the performance of his official duties, or corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstructs, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice shall be punished as provided . . ."

In the present indictment, defendant Cueto is charged with violations of the "Omnibus Clause", to wit: with "corruptly endeavor[ing] to influence, obstruct, and impede the due administration of justice of two grand juries' proceedings and certain court proceedings. In Counts 2 and 7, defendant Cueto

is charged with violating §1503 with regard to the court proceedings in Venezia v. Robinson and U.S. v. B & H Vending/Ace Music by preparing and filing and causing to be prepared and filed false pleadings and court papers in the federal district and appellate courts. In Count 3, defendant Cueto is charged with violating §1503 with regard to the 1994 Grand Jury investigation in the Venezia - B & H Vending racketeering case by advising a grand jury witness that it was unnecessary to appear in response to a grand jury subpoena, and that if the witness did appear to testify, that such witness should assert his Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination. Finally, Counts 4 and 6 charge defendant Cueto with violating §1503 with regard to the 1994 Grand Jury investigation in the Venezia - B & H Vending racketeering case and the subsequent trial of the Venezia - B & H Vending racketeering case by instructing Venezia to replace gambling machines after the federal authorities gambling raid, by instructing Venezia's counsel to remove statements from court pleadings referencing Cueto's instructions to Venezia to replace the seized gambling machines, and by engaging in acts designed to facilitate the indictment of Agent Bonds Robinson, including the offering of a judicial position to the St. Clair County State's Attorney so that Cueto could fill the vacancy of the State's Attorney position (presumably in order to indict Robinson).

The Court has carefully reviewed the parties' pleadings and the relevant caselaw. It is this Court's considered opinion that the indictment properly alleges violations of §1503 and should not be dismissed.

The court agrees that after thoroughly reviewing Cueto's pleadings, it appears that the entire substance of his arguments is the (in)sufficiency of the evidence to prove the allegations contained in the indictment. This is not a proper basis for a motion to dismiss the indictment. However, upon further reflection, and broad interpretation of defendant's motion and

responsive pleadings, the Court is willing to consider defendant's argument as one being that the indictment is invalid (as it pertains to Counts 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7) because the allegations, even if true and accurate, fail to constitute criminal offenses under §1503. To be valid, an indictment must allege acts, which if proven, would constitute an offense under the law that the defendant is charged with violating. U.S. v. Bucey, 876 F.2d 1297, 1302 (7th Cir. 1989).

Section 1503 prohibits a person from endeavoring to obstruct or impede the "due administration of justice". In order to establish a violation of §1503, the Government must demonstrate that the defendant knew of a pending judicial or grand jury proceeding and intended to impede its administration. U.S. v. Aguilar, ___ U.S. ___, 115 S.Ct. 2357, 2362 (1995); U.S. v. Maloney, 71 F.3d. 645, 656 (7th Cir. 1995); U.S. v. Bucey, at 1314. It is not sufficient that there be an intent to influence an ancillary proceeding, such as an investigation independent of a court's or grand jury's authority. Aguilar, 115 S.Ct. At 2362. However, investigations undertaken with the intention of presenting evidence before a grand jury are sufficient to constitute "the due administration of justice" under §1503. Maloney, at 657. A "nexus relationship" must be shown; i.e. the acts alleged must have a relationship in time, causation, or logic with the judicial or grand jury proceedings. Aguilar, 115 S.Ct. at 2362. "In other words, the endeavor must have the 'natural and probable effect' of interfering with the due administration of justice." Aguilar, 115 S.Ct. at 2362. A defendant's actions need not be successful in order to be prosecuted under §1503. All that is required is that the defendant has knowledge or notice that his or her actions are likely to affect the just administration of the subject proceedings. Aguilar, 115 S.Ct. at 2362; Bucey, at 1314; U.S. v. Machi, 811 F.2d. 991, 997-98. Section 1503 has both and "intent" element and a "means" element; "[i]t makes conduct punishable where the defendant acts with an intent to obstruct justice, and in a manner that is likely to obstruct justice, but is

foiled in some way." Aguilar, 115 S.Ct. at 2563.

Cueto's argument for dismissing the subject counts is grounded in two basic contentions: 1) the acts alleged are not illegal in themselves; and 2) there is no "nexus relationship" between any of the alleged acts and an "endeavor" to obstruct the due administration of any pending judicial or grand jury proceeding. Consequently, Cueto avers, that the indictment fails to proscribe any criminal act upon which he can be convicted. Defendant's argument is meritless.

Firstly, Cueto's argument is misplaced in that he focuses entirely upon the legality of the acts alleged in these counts, and not on the requisite criminal intent proscribed by §1503. He contends that he cannot be held criminally liable for filing false legal papers or for advising someone to assert their constitutional rights. Normally, this might be true; however, "[i]t is equally clear, from both the plain meaning of the statutory language and the caselaw interpreting it, that §1503 criminalizes conduct which obstructs or impedes the due administration of justice, provided such conduct is undertaken with a corrupt or improper purpose." U.S. v. Cintolo, 818 F.2d. 980, 990-91 (1st Cir. 1987). Courts have routinely interpreted federal obstruction statutes, including §1503, as encompassing means, that are not illegal in themselves, when employed to obstruct justice as falling within the purview of the "corrupt endeavor" language of the statutes. U.S. v. Mitchell, 877 F.2d. 294, 299 (4th Cir. 1989) (citations omitted); *see also*, U.S. v. Mitchell, 985 F.2d. 1275, 1278 (4th Cir. 1993). "The proper inquiry is whether a defendant had the requisite corrupt intent to improperly influence the investigation, not on the means the defendant employed in bringing to bear this influence." Mitchell, 877 F.2d. at 299 *citing* Cintolo, at 991-93.

Defendant Cueto's status as an attorney provides him with no protection from prosecution under §1503. The argument that acts clothed, in part, in the "mantle of superficially

'professional'" conduct exonerate the lawyer from culpability has been rejected by the courts. Cintolo, at 990. "As important a role as defense counsel serve - and we do not minimize its importance one whit - the acceptance of a retainer by a lawyer in a criminal case cannot become functionally equivalent to the lawyer's acceptance of a roving commission to flout the criminal law with impunity. A criminal lawyer has no license to act as a lawyer-criminal." Cintolo, at 990.

Even advising a client to assert the Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination can become a criminal act under §1503 if done with the requisite "corrupt endeavor" to impede or influence the due administration of justice in a grand jury or court proceeding. Courts have held that it is a violation of §1503 to influence a witness not to recall something or even to invoke the Fifth Amendment, if such advice is given with the requisite corrupt intent. Mitchell, 877 F.2d. at 299; Cintolo, at 992-93; U.S. v. McComb, 744 F.2d. 555, 563 (7th Cir. 1984); see, U.S. v. Cioffi, 493 F.2d. 1111, 1119 (2nd Cir. 1974); U.S. v. Cole, 329 F.2d. 437, 440-43 (9th Cir. 1964); *see also*, Maness v. Meyers, 419 U.S. 449, 470 n.19 (1975).

It is clear that otherwise lawful means, even those undertaken by an attorney in the course of representing a client, "can transgress §1503 if employed with the corrupt intent to accomplish that which the statute forbids." Cintolo, at 993.

As to the lack of a "nexus relationship" between the acts alleged and the grand juries' investigations, this argument too fails. The indictment, taken as a whole, vividly describes and alleges a continuing scheme by defendant Cueto involving many activities, including the ones highlighted in the subject counts, undertaken with the "corrupt endeavor" to impede, obstruct, or influence the investigation of the grand juries involved in the Venezia - B & H Vending racketeering case, as well as this case. The acts highlighted in the subject counts cannot be taken out of

context of the scheme or viewed in isolation. The indictment clearly alleges that due to defendant Cueto's law firm's representation of certain individuals and by virtue of defendant Cueto's own activities, Cueto was aware of the 1994 grand jury's investigation and that the investigation was a continuation of its predecessor grand jury's work. The indictment details defendant Cueto's intimate association with Venezia and several persons who ultimately became grand jury witnesses during the investigation by the grand jury and the prosecution of the racketeering case. The indictment specifically outlines the federal law enforcement investigation tie-in to the grand jury's investigation. The indictment sufficiently alleges enough facts from which a jury could readily find that defendant Cueto acted with the knowledge and corrupt intent to believe that the success of his corrupt endeavor would likely influence, impede, or obstruct the due administration of the pending grand jury or court proceedings. To summarize, the Court finds that the indictment sufficiently alleges a "nexus relationship" in time, causation, or logic between the acts alleged and pending grand jury or judicial proceedings.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that defendant Cueto's motion to dismiss Counts 2 and 7, 3, and 4 and 6 of the Indictment (#39) be and is DENIED.

Dated is 25th day of March, 1997.

Stephen N. Limbaugh
United States District Judge